

Comment for planning application 22/00489/F

Application Number	<input type="text" value="22/00489/F"/>
Location	<input type="text" value="Os Parcel 9078 And 9975 Adjoining Stocking Lane And North Of Rattlecombe Road Stocking Lane Shenington"/>
Proposal	<input type="text" value="Erection of 49 dwellings (17 of which (35%) will be affordable homes) with associated garages, parking and refuse storage, private gardens and communal open space/play space, hard and soft landscaping (including SUDs feature and means of enclosure, reinstatement of hedging and ironstone walling along Rattlecombe Road)"/>
Case Officer	<input type="text" value="Robin Forrester"/>
Organisation Name	<input type="text" value="jeremy longland"/>
Address	<input type="text" value="The Baulks,Rattlecombe Road,Shenington,Banbury,OX15 6LZ"/>
Type of Comment	<input type="text" value="Objection"/>
Type	<input type="text" value="neighbour"/>
Comments	<input type="text" value="Please see attached file for my objections to this proposal. Regards Mr J Longland"/>
Received Date	<input type="text" value="23/03/2022 18:13:55"/>
Attachments	The following files have been uploaded: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• CherwellObjection (1).pdf

The Baulks
Rattlecombe Road
Shenington
OX156LZ

Cherwell District Council

Bodicote House

Bodicote

Banbury

Oxon

OX154AA

16 March 2022

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: Planning Application Number: 22/00489/F [SITE OS Parcel 9078 and 9975 Adjoining Stocking Lane and North of Rattlecombe Road]

As a resident, I believe the proposed development will have a negative impact on the village. My specific objections are as follows:

Planning on this site was previously refused and the reasons are still relevant

Application 01/02422/OUT was withdrawn after the council officer report stated 8 reasons for refusing the proposal. I think the following 7 are still relevant and they will be referenced in my personal objections later in this document:

- 1. The proposed development is contrary to Policies H13, H18 and C13 of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan which seek to guide residential development to within the existing built-up limits of the settlement. In this case the proposed development is outside the existing built-up limit of the settlement and is therefore classed as open countryside where its development would constitute and unjustified and undesirable intrusion into the countryside and would be contrary to the Policies intended to protect the character and appearance of the countryside*
- 2. The proposed development is contrary to Policy TR5 of the adopted Local Plan as the access from which it is proposed to serve the development is substandard in vision terms and its use for the purpose proposed will result in a detriment to the safety of other road users.*
- 3. The proposed development is contrary to Policy TR2 of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan as the highway network is unsuitable to serve the development proposed and traffic generated as a product will increase the hazards to other road users and pedestrians.*
- 4. Having regard to the location of the proposed development and lack of suitable transportation facilities it is considered that the proposal is not sustainable and is thus contrary to Policies G1 and T18 of the Oxfordshire Structure Plan.*
- 5. The proposed means of access onto Rattlecombe road would result in the loss of a significant section of attractive and historical ironstone retaining wall and the creation of an engineered adoptable standard highway access, which would cause harm to the character and integrity of the wall and the character and appearance of the street scene contrary to Policies C13 and C28 of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan.*

6. *In the absence of an adequate means of sewage disposal to serve the development the proposal would exacerbate these existing infrastructure problems which, until improved and upgraded, would lead to additional potential pollution of watercourses in the vicinity of the present public sewer system. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies ENV1 and ENV7 of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan.*
7. *That notwithstanding reason 1 above, the proposed development by seeking to create, proportionately, a significant and single estate type development which would be in conflict with the historical settlement pattern of the village and is contrary to Policy C27 of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan.*

Objection: Increased safety risk to pedestrians

I have read transport statement document provided as part of the application and strongly disagree to the statement that the new housing estate will create a “*low level of additional traffic can be safely accommodated on the local highway network*”

Let me consider the phrase “Safely accommodated” first.

Rattlecombe Road has specific several squeeze points that make it single track and require cars to stop to allow passing traffic. One outside Rattlecombe Hollow is on the approach to the proposed new access. It is also normal for home owners to park on Rattlecombe Road for primary and overflow parking and this is within the visibility of the proposed access partially shown by [Figure 5] in the Transport Plan. At school peak times the single track squeeze point on Stocking Lane causes a traffic jam at the T junction with Rattlecombe Road backing cars up towards the proposed new access point and towards Alkerton. In Alkerton two dangerous blind bends on Rattlecombe Road on the hill adjacent to Tanners Pool cause traffic issues. I note that the report states that only one slight accident is recorded in the last 5 years however as a resident of 20 years I am aware that this is a black spot and I have personally experienced near misses where cars have overtaken me on the blind corner and had to break suddenly due to oncoming traffic.

As a pedestrian, cyclist or horse rider it is necessary **to walk/cycle/ride in** Rattlecombe Road as there are very few pavements. I currently exit my driveway and walk along Rattlecombe Road into Shenington, as do most residents living on and near Rattlecombe Road as it is the main road through Shenington.

My 90 year old mother, who has dementia, lives in The Level uses a wheelchair or mobility scooter and exits onto Rattlecombe Road and travels along it for a distance to get to friend’s houses. I often push her wheelchair as do her team of carers, I also monitor her progress in her own electric mobility scooter. She drives it with the care, safety and attention that you would expect from her age and mental/physical condition. An additional 1/3rd of households would add an additional 30 percent of vehicles resident in Shenington. This would increase number of occurrences of the risk from each passing vehicle by the same.

Shenington has a number of footpaths and is common to see walkers frequently connecting the footpaths East and West by walking along Rattlecombe Road.

There are several bridleways accessible within Shenington and it is common daily for riders to use Rattlecombe Road to access them, myself included.

School children congregate on the village green to get picked up and dropped off by a school bus and walk down Rattlecombe Road to access their homes. There are numerous reasons Shenington

residents daily walk in Rattlecombe Road. The new housing estate access and additional traffic load will significantly increase the safety risk of doing this.

Secondly the statement *“low level of additional traffic”*

The transport statement only includes an estimate of additional residential traffic it doesn't include additional figures for utility, business traffic and visitors to and from the proposed housing estate. Shenington is in a rural location with the majority of people needing to get to work by car there are few amenities no local shops or secondary schools, leisure centres. Most journeys involve the car as the local bus service is minimal. It is also usual for young adults to pass driving tests early so they can drive themselves. Car density is high. Considering the increase in residents and cars in relation to the number of existing residents and cars I would disagree with the transport statement and say pro rata there would be a high level of additional traffic.

Objection: Negative impact on the nature and character of the village

Shenington, according to the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031, is a Category C village and development is limited to infilling and conversions. This proposed development is not infill or a conversion. This development is intended to develop open countryside into a housing estate [Reference Previous Refusal reason 1 and 7 above]

Since this previous refusal Shenington has gained Conservation Status and this proposed development is adjacent to the Conservation Area and would negatively impact it, spoiling views from the conservation area, increasing noise from extra traffic and additional residential activities, impacting the setting of many listed buildings in the conservation area.

The landscape and visual assessment report(LVA) states that the proposed development would be visible from a high wold adjacent AONB to the east of the proposed development. As the proposed development would not conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the AONB impacted it should be rejected. In addition the report states that “the site comprises agricultural land and does not perform a clearly identifiable and valuable function”. I disagree with this statement as I think that agricultural land does provide a valuable function to society.

Objection: Utilities will be overwhelmed

[Reference Previous Refusal Reason 6 above] the proposed development application states that it will use Mains Sewage. There is no information on how and if this is possible considering that the existing sewage infrastructure for Shenington is already at capacity.

Conclusion

The planning application 22/00489/F should be rejected for many of the same reasons the previous application was refused. It is an unsafe proposal that would negatively impact Shenington which does not have the highway provision or utility provision to support it. It would also spoil the nature and character of the historic village.

Mr J Longland.